

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/601,062	06/20/2003	Michael C. Brakefield	-	5529
24919	7590 10/29/2004		EXAM	INER
MCAFEE &		DOUGLAS, STEVEN O		
TENTH FLOOR, TWO LEADERSHIP SQUARE 211 NORTH ROBINSON			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73102			3751	`

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/601,062	BRAKEFIELD ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Steven O. Douglas	3751			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 June 2003</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 						
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 16-22 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,7-10 and 13-15 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 5,6,11 and 12 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachmen	t(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary (PTO 413)			
2) Notice (3) Inform	te of References Cited (FTO-392) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

 Claims 1-22, drawn to a portable liquid transfer system, classified in class 141, subclass 231.

II. Claims 23-29, drawn to a method for optimizing fuel prices, classified in class141, subclass 1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II. and I. are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process such a method not requiring movement and connection to both a transport truck and rail car.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Clifford Dougherty, III. on 10-25-04 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I., claims 1-22. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 23-29 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

Application/Control Number: 10/601,062 Page 3

Art Unit: 3751

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4,7,9,10 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by La Terra.

The La Terra reference discloses a trailer-mounted aircraft refueling apparatus comprising a pump (unlabeled), a diesel fuel powered engine 19, a flow meter 36, an inlet hose 14, and an outlet hose 26.

In regard to claims 4 and 10, the function of transferring diesel fuel has been considered and deemed not to impose structure on the claims distinguishable over the La Terra device which is capable of transferring diesel fuel if so desired.

In regard to claims 7 and 14, all introductory and functional statements of intended use have been carefully considered but deemed not to impose any structure of the claims distinguishable over the La Terra device which is capable of transferring fuel from a railroad tanker car to a transport trailer as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Application/Control Number: 10/601,062

Art Unit: 3751

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over La Terra in view of Ruffa.

The La Terra reference discloses a liquid transfer device (supra), but does not disclose an alarm as claimed. The Ruffa reference discloses another liquid transfer device (usable in aircraft fuel tanks) having an alarm 60 to indicate a full condition in the receiving tank. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the La Terra device to have an alarm in view of the teachings of the Ruffa reference to indicate a full condition in the receiving tank.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Topping et al. and McConnel et al. references pertain to liquid transfer devices having fill line purge features, and the Mendez reference pertains to a diesel engine utilizing hauled diesel fuel to fuel the engine.

Claims 16-22 are allowed.

Claims 5,6,11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven O. Douglas whose telephone number is 703-308-0891. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 6:00-6:30.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven O. Douglas Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

SD 10-28-04